WELLCOME COLLECTION

THE

Healing Paper:

OR, A

Catholick Receipt for UNION

Between the

Moderate Biſhop & Sober Non-conformiſt,

Maugre all the Averſation of the Unpeaceable.

By a Follower of Peace, and Lover of Sincerity.

J. Humphreys.

For we muſt needs Dye, and are as Water ſpilt upon the Ground, which cannot be gathered up again: Neither doth God reſpect any Perſon, yet doth he deviſe Means that his Baniſhed be not expelled from him. 2 Sam. 14. 14.

16.7.14.7
(2), 390

John Humphreys.

LONDON, Printed for *B. T.* and *T. M.* 1678.

THE
Epiſtle Dedicatory.

SEeing Dedications are become Cuſtomary, I will chooſe me a Patron for this Book, as a Papiſt chooſes his Saint. He fancies ſuch a one will be Propitious to his Affairs, and addreſſes himſelf to him in his Prayers, but knows not whether he hears him or no. The Perſon whom I chooſe to make this Dedication to, ſhall be the Honourable Mr. *Speaker* of the Houſe of Commons, whom I know not, nor he me in the leaſt. If he did, this would be Flattery, which now is Adventure; and might be but a Blurr, which now is Honour. I do fancy that Perſon to be an impartial perſpicacious Gentleman, and that he will therefore like the Honeſty and Innocency of theſe Sheets. I do Fancy, that as it is hard to find a Parallel to him in ſufficiency for his Province, ſo it is not eaſy (in the circumſtances Speakers are) to have a Man in the Chair of more Integrity (or natural Byaſs) to the Publick Good; and ſo far as I know, to the Proteſtant Cauſe. I do fancy that he will not therefore in good earneſt turn off any ſeaſonable well-digeſted Motion (if any be tendred in the Houſe) for Moderation in the buſineſs of Religion. I do think him verily a man Unconcern'd for the Non-

conformiſts, but not Malicious to Good People; and though Portly, not ſo High as to be Offended at a Mean mans good Conceit of him. I am perſwaded, that in my ſphear, I cannot put a greater Dignity upon him (if he ſerves our End) than by the peculiarity of ſuch a Dedication. If he deceives me, and proves one that deſignes any thing Evil, and not the beſt things for the Church of God, let him anſwer it to the Almighty: He ſhall be no longer my Patron on Earth, nor Saint in Heaven.

The Author.

To the Reader.

THE Deſigne of this Paper is to chalk out the Way for the Parliament (*if they ſhall kindly pleaſe*) *to Open the Door of the Church for us: but if they will not, to Draw the Latch, and come in our ſelves.* And it ſhall yet come to paſs, that there ſhall come a People, and the Inhabitants of many Cities, and go to one another, ſaying, Let us go ſpeedily to pray before the Lord, and to ſeek the Lord of Hoſts; I will go alſo.

The

The Healing Paper.

IF I had any longer hope or truſt in our *Publick Phyſicians*, that they would lay to heart the Breaches of the Church, and endeavour the *Cure* of thoſe *Wounds* which ſhe hath *received in the Houſe of her Friends*, by ſome Univerſal Accommodation of Proteſtants one with another; which would be the ſtrength of the Nation againſt Forreign Enemies, and the Security of our Religion at Home, I ſhould forbear the Studying out any of theſe leſſer and private Remedies in our caſe, for fear of being guilty of the *Healing the Hurt of the Daughter of Gods People ſlightly*, which were a fault indeed if I could do it better: but when no more can be done, God forbid I ſhould ceaſe to offer my laſt mite to the Work, in ſhewing the way that is yet left us (and conſequently the duty for ought I know on both ſides unto which we are bound) how to do it; not diſtruſting the favour of God, and many good men in the Action.

There is a Rule therefore I muſt lay down between the *Nonconformiſt* and the *Biſhop* for my proceeding in this great Deſign. I will ſuppoſe them both ſenſible, that an endeavour after *Concord* as brethren in the ſame *Reformed Religion*, is an undeniable duty; and that a wilful neglect of it cannot be Anſwered unto God by either Party, whoſoever of them ſhall be found in Default. The Rule then for Accommodation which I have to offer, in the Name of God, as equal to both, is this: That the Nonconformiſt be ready to do in the ſincerity of his Conſcience *what he can*; and that out of the like conſcience to God, the Biſhop do bear with him in *what he cannot*; ſo long as by this means, or upon theſe termes, they ſo agree and unite in the *Main*, as the *Eſtabliſht Order* be kept up in the *Land*. It is but *Reaſonable* the *Biſhop* look to *This*, and it is *Neceſſary* that *Wee* look to our *Conſciences*. The Rule is in order to the End; and if they will abate to us in the *Circumſtances*, or in the *Leſſer things enjoyned*, ſo much as we may preſerve our Conſciences, and abate no more but that the *Eſtabliſhment* (which being made by King and Parliament requires our Subjection) may be preſerved in the *Subſtance*, or in the *greater concerns* of it, I ſee not, but for Peace ſake, for our Souls ſake, for the Churches ſake, the thing ſhould be done. The Non-

conformiſt is to conſider well the import of ſuch Texts as require *Subjection to the Higher Powers*; and he is out of Conſcience to the *Fifth Commandement* to comply with their Injunctions to the uttermoſt that may give them ſatisfaction ſo far as he can without Sin. The Biſhop is to conſider the import of ſuch Texts, as tell us what a dangerous thing it is to give occaſion to the *Doubtful* to do any thing *againſt their Conſciences:* and he is out of Conſcience to the *Sixth Commandement* (for fear of *deſtroying him for whom Chriſt dyed*) to take heed as he would of his life, to put a man upon any more than he is convinced he can ſafely do. When the *Nonconformiſt* does what he can, the Law of God will bear him out in that which he does not; and if he ſuffers, he has peace in his Soul. If the *Biſhop* likewiſe ſhall *Receive* a man upon this account, as one that cannot require more of him, leſt he *wound his weak Conſcience*, and ſo *ſins againſt Chriſt*, I do not doubt but the Law of God will juſtifie him alſo in whatſoever he falls ſhort in the execution of the Law of Man. I know the *Law* does indeed make no difference between thoſe that would do what they can, and thoſe that do any thing leſs than all it requires; but the great Law of *Charity*, *Mercy* and *Righteouſneſs*, or of *Meeting to others that meaſure as we would have met to us* in the like caſe, does require other things. This is a Truth to be made known and propagated to the Nation, that all Laws or Injunctions of Men whatſoever, which are not conſiſtent with the Law of Nature, or Word of God (ſo far I ſay as they are inconſiſtent therewith) are void, null, and no Laws. *Nihil minus ſunt quam leges*, as *Cicero (De legibus)* does expreſs it. That is, (I will interpret him) they can lay no obligation on the *Conſcience* (which is the eſſential property of a right Law) as to the obſervance. It is true, if the Biſhop Diſpences, and the Non-conformiſt comes ſhort in any thing, the Penalty may be Sued, if any be ſo affected. It is a Law in *foro humano*, and we muſt never reſiſt (This we muſt venture, and can but be in *ſtatu quo*): but it is no Law in *foro Dei*, or *Conſcientiæ*; for the Authority of theſe greater Laws of *Nature* and *Religion* does ſuperſede the Execution; ſo that there is no guilt contracted in the Omiſſion.

And having ſaid this, I do not care to profeſs my ſelf one, that am prepared to come into the Church upon theſe Terms; that is, I will come in upon *Quarter*; for I can come in no otherwiſe: If the Biſhop will give me *Quarter for my Conſcience*, and ſpare me in the things, which it were a *Killing me to do* while I am in *Doubt*, I will

will yield in the reſt. We will, we muſt yield (I judge) upon theſe Terms: To do *what we can*, if they will but do (upon this ſcore, I ſay, of thoſe Superiour Laws) *what they ought*. There are no Texts which require Unity among Chriſtians, *To be of one mind*, To *ſpeak the ſame things*, To have *one Heart*: No Texts, that require *Love* and *Fellowſhip* with one another as Brethren, the *Following of Peace*, a Tenderneſs to one anothers Conſciences, and taking heed of *Offending* any of Chriſt's *Little Ones*, and the like matters: No Texts, that forbid *Schiſm* and Diviſions in the *Church*, with the Evil Concomitants and Effects thereof in the *Nation*, but they are all Warrants to the *Biſhop*, for his *Forbearance* and Moderation in the *Execution* of theſe *Laws*, when his *Non-Conformiſt-Brother* cannot obey them without ſinning againſt his *Soul*. God ſays, Thou ſhalt not do any thing, which will deſtroy thy Brother, and wound his Conſcience: The Law ſays, Thou ſhalt put him to do thus, and not diſpenſe with him. Chriſt ſays, You muſt do thus, You muſt do theſe things. The Law ſays, You muſt do that which is otherwiſe. Whom ſhall the good *Biſhop* now chooſe to obey, the *Law* of his *God*, or the *Statutes* of the *Realm*?

Not that I will find fault with my Superiours, or with their Laws; onely as the Apoſtle ſayes of the Law of God it ſelf, *We know the Law is good if a Man uſe it Lawfully*: So muſt I ſay upon ſuppoſition, that theſe Acts for Conforming be in *themſelves*, what they are in the *Minds* of the *Conformiſts*, good Laws, and for the peace of the Church, ſo long as they be Executed upon fit Reaſons, and ſuch Perſons for whom all Laws are indeed to be made, (*The Law is not made for the Righteous*, or the willing, ſayes the ſame Divine Author, *but the Unrighteous and Diſobedient*): Yet when they are Adminiſtred to all alike without putting any difference between the *Willing* and the *Unwilling*, the *Ready* and the *Refractory*, that which was intended for *Good*, *is made Death unto us*, (to ſpeak ſtill in Holy Language) by becoming inſtead of a means for promoting of *Peace*, an occaſion for eſtabliſhing our *Diviſions*. I ſee indeed that moſt Men with whom the Laws are entruſted, do act ordinarily, as if all they were concern'd in the hurt that comes by any Law, were no more but to impute it to the Law-makers, and to account themſelves clear before God and Men, ſo long as they are but exact in putting the ſame in rigorous Execution: whereas there is no *power given*, or can be *received* by any, but to the great

ends of Gods Glory, and the common good of Men (for *all Power is of God*), and consequently no such trust is committed to them but in Subordination to the higher Laws of *Nature*, and *Gods Word*; so that if *these* Laws and *Mans* Laws do come in any instances of Life to *clash*, as commonly in matters of conscience they do, there is prudence to be used in such a discernment between *Persons* and *Persons*, those that are *truly*, and those that are *pretendedly* conscencious, and between *things* and *things*, what will *profit the Church*, and what will tend onely to *publick offence*, that both the *ends of Government* may be kept up, and the *greater Laws* take place. *According to the authority the Lord hath given us* (saies the Apostle) *for Edification, and not for Destruction.*

Neither do I once imagin that the Bishop can dispense with me in any Imposition committed to his trust, so as that his dispensation should be my warrant for my doing otherwise then the Law requires I should do, either in *regard to Man*, if he will prosecute the Law upon me (as I have intimated before) or in *regard to God* if it were any Sin or Evil in me to break it: But he can *bear* with me as to his part, which is enough (for I may then venture others, I have also said,) and it is the superiour authority of God which is the warrant both to him and me upon which we must be justified, in my *conformity* onely *so far*, and his *requiring no more*. The Law, it is true requires more, and it requires him to require more, but the greater Law (I say) of the Ten Commandements of God, which is sum'd up in this one Word, *Love*, the transcript of the Law Eternal upon Mans heart, must over-rule, and relaxes the obligation as to both of us in the sight of God. And thus when we do what we can for union on both sides, and no more than we can on either side: When we bear with one another, in the things wherein we differ, and *bear one anothers burdens* as we are bound in the common accidents of our Lives, we shall *Compound* (I hope) for our failings or *Non-performance* to an *Act of Parliament*, by our *fulfilling the Law of Christ*. Be *of the same mind* (saies the Apostle) *one towards another. Mind not high things, but condescend to Men of low estate.*

In fine, Our eyes have almost failed us in looking out after every Session of Parliament to do somthing for Union, and they do it not. It is another course then must be sought; The *Bishop* alone and we must resolve to do the business our selves. That which we cannot get done by a *relaxation* of the *Laws*, may be ob-

obtained by little and little, by a *Relaxation* of our *ſtifneſs* on both ſides. If the concerns of the Church lies nearer any one of their hearts, than his own bare Honour and Worldly intereſt does, he will venture as we do, and what we cannot procure by an *Act*, we muſt force by *Example*, and the Authority of Heaven, and the Proteſtant cauſe ſhall be our Broad Seal for what we do.

Having thus propoſed the Rule, I muſt proceed to Practiſe. We have ſeveral Impoſitions therfore to come under conſideration, and they are the *Old*, or the *New*.

For the *Old*, there is in the firſt place the *Common Prayer* it ſelf which I muſt confeſs for my own part I do commonly hear, and in the *Ordinary daily ſervice* I do not think unlawful to read. And God forbid I ſhould, when we have had ſo many Holy Men in the *Marian* Reign ready to lay down their lives for the Matter of this Book. If I find ſcruple in reſpect to ſome things in the *By-Offices*, or in any thing of the *Occaſional* ſervice, I will either my ſelf wave it, or leave that work to ſome other to perform. There is next an Aſſent required to the Articles of the Church of England, unto the *Doctrine* whereof according to the ſtatute of the thirteenth of *Elizabeth* (that is ſo far as is expreſsly required) I do not find but the Nonconformiſts generally are ready to ſubſcribe of their own accord. I have a few exceptions for my own part, which I doubt not but they will be allowed me to make, being conſonant to the Judgments moſtly of thoſe that conform, and contrary to theirs, more generally who do not; I may name ſome of them ere I have done. There is then the *Subſcription* in the *Canons*, and *Canonical Oath* of Obedience, which being not impoſed by Law, or a ſtatute, but by a penal Canon, and that onely rendring the Biſhop upon neglect obnoxious to a ſuſpenſion from giving Orders, or Licences to Preach for a year, which is never like to be proſecuted, nor I ſuppoſe uſed to be, it was heretofore very ordinary for many Biſhops to forbear the exacting of either of theſe (which were abated to me without any regret at my Ordination): and I ſhall hope that what hath bin done in former time out of *favour*, will be done now out of *conſcience*, if this Rule laid down does, as it ought, take place.

For the New Impoſitions, there are three of them in the Act of Uniformity, The *Declaration*, the *Subſcription*, and *Re-ordination*. The *laſt* of theſe [*Re-ordination*] I have paſſed, yet as to others I

must say this. That to be Re-ordain'd to the *Work of a new Charge*, I am fully perswaded is Lawful, and consequently, that this matter may be easily Compounded, between the Bishop, and him that scruples the thing (for too just Reason otherwise) upon this said Account. The *foremost*, the *Declaration*, is to be made to the *Congregation*, and I think to do thus. I will Read the Common-Prayer in the *Ordinary daily Service* (which I have said I hold Lawful), and then I will declare my *Assent* and *Consent*, to all and every particular I have Read. And I do not doubt, but this will be as good a Declaration to the Church-Wardens, as if I had used the *Words* of the Act and *no other*. I will not conceal from them that I save my Conscience, but will venture it. If it be told the Bishop, I will expect that he should be more like to Connive at that which is entrusted with *others*, than to Indulge any in the *Second*, and chief thing that remaines, which is committed only to *his* trust, and wherein, if we obtain not some Condescention from him, we must continue in our ejected Estate. And this is the *Subscription*, in reference to which mainely, I do now present to the Publick this Paper; and in pursuance of my own Rule of doing what I can, I am willing for an Authoritative use of my Ministry, to Subscribe the words ensuing.

This Declaration in the Act of Uniformity, viz. *I do declare that it is not lawful upon any pretence whatsoever, to take Arms against the King; and that I do abhor that Trayterous Position of taking Arms by his Authority against his Person, or against those that are Commissionated by him; and that I will Conform to the Liturgy of the Church of* England, *as it is now established; and I do Declare, that I do hold, that there lies no Obligation upon me, or any other Person, from the Oath commonly called the Solemn League and Covenant, to endeavor any change or alteration of Government either in Church or State; and that the same was in it self an unlawful Oath, and imposed upon the Subjects of this Realm, against the known Laws and Liberties of this Kingdom*, I subscribe with these Limitations or Exceptions.

The first Clause I hold *Indefinitly* true in a due and a fair

fair ſtate of the Point, as it is maintain'd by ſuch eminent and faithful Aſſertors of the Authority of Princes, as *Arniſæus*, *Barclay*, *Grotius*, *Sarrania*, and the like Authors: And upon ſuch a meet State of the Poſition (*prout prudens definierit*) ſuppoſed, I do Subſcribe *That it is not lawful to take Arms againſt the King, upon any pretence what-ſo-ever.*

The Second Clauſe I allow with this Interpretation only, which I think to be the Mind of the Legiſlators. By the Word *Abhor*, I underſtand in the cool Senſe, no more than I *Diſclaim*; and ſuch a *Poſition* I count *Trayterous*, if it be made uſe of for Rebellion: And I underſtand by the Words *Thoſe that are Commiſſionated by him*, ſuch only as are *Legally Commiſſionated by him*, and in the *Legal Purſuit of ſuch Commiſſions*. It could never be the Intent of the Majority of Parliament to advance the King's *will* above *Law*; and therefore, this being their Meaning, I do in this Meaning, (or with theſe Explanatory Limitations to their Meaning, if I be miſtaken in it) Subſcribe *That I abhor that Trayterous Poſition, of taking Arms by the Authority of the King, againſt his Perſon, or againſt thoſe that are Commiſſionated by him.*

The Third Clauſe, is a Promiſe which I dare not make, but with the Reſervation of a neceſſary and juſt Liberty, both for my *Conſcience*, in any matter or thing wherein I *doubt*; and for *Prudence*, in regard to *Time*, *Place*, and *Circumſtances*; to act, as appears to me moſt conducive to the *Intereſt* of the *Church*, and *Edification* of the *People*: And with ſuch a Reſervation as this, I Subſcribe *That I will Conform to the* Liturgy *of the Church of* England, *as it is now by Law Eſtabliſhed.*

The *Fourth* Clauſe I can Subſcribe to readily, as to my ſelf, becauſe I never took the Covenant, (I was convinced, I remember, by the *Oxford* Reaſons, and it was againſt my Conſcience): But for the Words, *Nor any other Perſon*, I muſt put in this Reſtriction; to wit, Nor any

any other in a *Private Capacity*, or *Acting in a Private Capacity*. It is true, (as I think) that every Man is bound to ſeek the Reformation of the Church in his Place: But it is as great a Truth, that it is not the place of a Private Perſon, or any one, to endeavour any Reformation of the Church or State, be it never ſo good, but with the Concurrence of the King, or in ſuch a way only, as is agreeable to the Conſtitution of the Kingdome. Nay, as he may not *act*, he may not exhort, *perſwade*, ſeek, or *pray* in a Seditious way, to have it done. Now, for-aſ-much, as this Covenant did lay an Obligation on the Subject, (in their Opinion) to endeavour the Reformation of the Church, without the Conſent of the King in his Parliament, I do apprehend that Obligation in that reſpect to be voyd, and Subſcribe *That I do hold, that there lyes no Obligation upon me or any other Perſon, from the Oath, commonly called the Solemn League or Covenant, to endeavour any Change or Alteration of Government, either in Church or State*, by any Means, or any other way, than with the Conſent of the King in an Act of Parliament.

The Fifth Clauſe does require a Diſtinction between the *Act of Covenanting*, and the *Matter Covenanted*. I dare not Subſcribe, That this Oath in the *Matter Covenanted*, was *in it ſelf Unlawful*, becauſe I muſt then (I think) be Uncharitable to the Reformed Churches abroad, whoſe Government is not as ours by Biſhops: But I do ſuppoſe, that the Oath in the *Act of Covenanting*, or the Oath, if taken for the Act *Complexly* conſidered, was in it ſelf Unlawful: So that, he that took it, did as I count, do ill in it, or did that, which in my Judgement was unwarrantable. A Combined endeavour to pull down the preſent Government of the Church, and ſet-up another, without the Conſent of the King, and againſt it (upon ſuppoſition only, which no doubt, will be generally granted, that the King did not loſe his Authority in the Sight of God, on his

his with-drawing from his Parliament, which muſt alſo be ſo underſtood, or elſe, how could they at the ſame time in one Branch of the ſaid Covenant, own the King, and his Authority, and ſwear to maintain them?) muſt be, I judg, a Breach of the Subject's Duty, required in the *Thirteenth* to the *Romans*. But the Covenant was ſuch an Act. Or thus, To own the King, and his Authority, in the ſame Oath, and yet to Swear to change the Government without his Will, and againſt it, is, I think, in it ſelf Unlawful. Such an Oath was the Covenant. Thus far I Subſcribe to this Clauſe, *That the ſame was in it ſelf an Unlawful Oath*, and I draw no farther.

The laſt Clauſe is (ſo far as I know) undoubtedly true; and therefore, I muſt, and do Subſcribe *And impoſed upon the Subjects of this Realm, againſt the known Laws and Liberties of this Kingdome.*

This is what I can, and am ready to Subſcribe; only, I muſt firſt make it Publick: I cannot ſatisfy my Conſcience elſe, to propoſe it in Private to the Biſhop, though it ſhould obtain, unleſs I Publiſh it: Both becauſe of *my Brethren*, that I may avoid *Scandal*; I mean not the Scandal of *Diſpleaſure*, which I care little for; but the Scandal *tending to Sin*, or to wound any of their Conſciences by my Example: And alſo, becauſe of the *Biſhop*; leſt I ſhould draw him into ſome Condeſcenſion, out of his preſent Goodneſs and Benignity, which he might Repent after; unleſs he be firſt come to a Reſolution of Mind, and ſo acts out of Conſcience; and that alone will bear him out againſt any Inconvenience, that can enſue: And more over, becauſe of *my own Soul and Temper*, that cannot endure to do any thing of this Nature, but what is open and fit for a plain Honeſt ſort of Man to do. And here there is but one thing in the general, wherein I ſeek favour of the Biſhop, which I muſt explain on the ſame Account.

I am ſenſible, that a Liberty of Subſcribing this Declaration, or ſubmitting to any Impoſition in our *own Senſe* or *Interpretation*, is a Favour ſignifies nothing: For, no Man that acts in Judgment and Conſcience, can make any Interpretation of a Law or Impo-

 ſition

ſition, but what he believes to be the Meaning of the Law-giver: If I am not ſatisfyed then in that Meaniug, I have no other Interpretation to make; and if I am ſatisfyed in that Meaning, I need no Favour or Liberty to be given me; for there is none can take this away from me, which neceſſarily goes to a *Judgment* of *Private Diſcretion*. I ſhall not care what any *Biſhop*, or *Judg* upon the Bench may ſay, to thwart me in the Caſe of the *Oxford-Oath*, ſince I Publiſhed my late Paper (unleſs I feel ſome Wavering in my Mind, or doubt of the Interpretation there delivered), notwithſtanding ſome of my Brethren were ſo much concern'd hereto-fore, with the Words of one about it. I ſhould be afraid of what he ſaid, if it were in a *Suit of Law*; but, the matter is otherwiſe in a *Caſe of Conſcience*; where I am to be juſtified by *God* alone, and not by a *Jury*. But to have a Liberty of Subſcribing or Submitting to an Impoſition, with ſome *Reſtriction*, *Limitation*, or *Exception*; this is indeed a Favour, which I ſeek in this Declaration. An *Interpretation* gives me Liberty (I count) only as to the *Words*, while I am yet tyed up to the Meaning of the Law-giver. A *Limitation* gives me Liberty, as to the *Meaning* of the Impoſer, as well as to the *Literal Conſtruction*, and that is a great matter. I cannot Subſcribe this Declaration, without ſuch a Liberty; and with ſuch a Liberty, I can Conform alſo to other Impoſitions. I know, that the Biſhop can give me no ſuch Liberty, as to limit, reſtrain, or make any Exception to the Meaning of the Law, any more than I can diſpenſe with my ſelf, I have ſaid: But, if he ſhall be got to paſs me for his part, I do not queſtion, but I ſhall paſs after with others, I have ſaid alſo. And as for the matter of Conſcience in it, I have laid down my Rule between us, and the Superiour Law of Almighty God, ſhall be the juſtification of us both in the purſuance of it, I have affirmed likewiſe.

I will here add one Argument. If there be any evil in this (the Subſcribing with *Limitation*), it muſt be either in regard to the *Fifth* Commandment, or the *Nineth*: Either becauſe it is againſt our duty of *Obedience* to the *Higher Powers*, or againſt our duty of *Sincerity* and *Truth*. Here is no Sin againſt Truth and Sincerity, for therefore do I make theſe Reſtrictions or Exceptions, that I may not forſake Truth, but keep my Sincerity in what I do. I declare to all the world, I will not go a ſtep further than my Conſcience goes along with me; and unleſs I have this liberty, or take it, I will not go on. And here is no Sin of diſobedience to my Superi-

ours

ours becauſe the Law of God forbids me to do more. It is a caſe decided by the Apoſtle, and yeilded, that when the Law of God hath laid an Obligation on the Conſcience already, the Law of man to the contrary can have no place. If my Non-conformiſt brother ſins not that ſubſcribes *Nothing* of this Declaration becauſe of his Conſcience, then do not I ſin that make my *Limitation*. If it were a ſin to make any of theſe Reſtrictions or Exceptions, how ſhall they be juſtified by the greater Law, that is the Law of God, who refuſe to Subſcribe any thing, becauſe they cannot Subſcribe to all upon that account? If I ſin in doing *what I can*, how ſhall Obedience to the Higher-Powers be a Duty? And if I ſin in doing *only what I can*, how ſhall my Brethren be acquitted that make no tryal at all, and do nothing? And yet do I make no doubt of their Integrity.

To frame any interpretation of the words of a Law, and ſo Subſcribe them in that ſenſe which a man believes is not the meaning of the Law-giver, is a prevarication of the Law; for he pretends to Subſcribe to the Law when he knows he does not, ſeeing it is the Law-givers *meaning*, and not the bare *words* is the Law: but when I declare that I do not Subſcribe to the Law in *ſuch* or *ſuch* particulars, but in *others*, Here is all the plainneſs that can be, and ſo no breach of Sincerity; and here is a doing what I can, and ſo no neglect of my duty. If any be ready to reply to me, then you *ſhould* have done thus, and been more expreſs upon the particulars of this Declaration, in ſhewing what we may agree to, and whereunto we are to make our exceptions: I would have that man to know that I *have* done thus. and with ſollicitude ſo far as does ſerve me, or ſave my own Conſcience; and it may ſuffice him that I have broken the ice, or opened the way for him to do that farther as he would have had me do, if his Conſcience be not ſatisfied without it, and he can get leave to do it Neither will my Shooes ſerve his feet, or my Gloves come on his hands: nor will my Limitations be the meaſure of every mans coalition.

Indeed I am ſorry here to be more Subtill then this comes to already. The Biſhop I ſuppoſe will give me liberty to Subſcribe *in my own Senſe*, and this I have ſaid ſignifies nothing: but I muſt recall my ſelf. It is nothing I mean, unleſs we ſtate this *liberty of our own ſenſe*, and know what we agree upon by it. If by a *liberty of our own ſenſe* any Biſhop ſhall candidly underſtand my Subſcribing this Declaration in ſuch a ſenſe as I can, though I believe it not to be the meaning of the Law, and he accepts of that, and lets me

expreſs it, this is no other then a *liberty of Exception*, and we muſt beware that we *ſtick* not on ſcruple, when we *agree* upon the *matter*. In the way, one thing is to be put out of doubt, that, though in Subſcribing to an Impoſition we muſt be ſuppoſed to ſubſcribe it in the meaning of the Impoſer if we ſay nothing, yet if we make our Limitations or Exceptions, and expreſs them (with leave to do ſo) we contract no guilt, or are obliged no further in Conſcience than we conſent thereunto and take the obligation on our Souls, as may appear in the Oath between *Rahab* and the *Spies*. I am ſorry therefore (I ſay) that I am forced here to be more critical and nice, than I would be. I can be content to diſtinguiſh an *Interpretation* and a *Limitation*, but I am very loath to diſtinguiſh any further, between the *Laſt* and an *Exception*, which vertually is implied in it, nevertheleſs ſeeing I am breaking my own way, and I cannot help it, and ſeeing the uſe of words we know is to expreſs the mind, and every man conſequently hath liberty over his own words to explain and diſtinguiſh them as he pleaſe, I will in the firſt place diſtinguiſh for once theſe things. An Interpretation, A Limitation, An Exception. An *Interpretation* let me ſay requires the Senſe or meaning of the Law-giver, and that altogether, and all of it. A *Limitation* requires that meaning, but not all of it. An *Exception* ſignifies a deniall of it. Again I muſt diſtinguiſh of the Submiſſion to an impoſition *upon favour*, or *without any*. In my former Paper about the *Oxford-Oath* I laid down a Rule to ſtrew the way for our coming up to an impoſition (where we can) without favour in thoſe that adminiſter it: In this Paper I proceed to lay down another for our ſubmiſſion in caſe of favour, when we cannot ſubmit to the Impoſition unleſs we obtain it. I muſt in the laſt place yet diſtinguiſh more-over between the Subſcribing to an Impoſition in the *form of words* wherein it is enjoyned, and the having liberty of our *own expreſſions*. I muſt confeſs, I have ſeveral times propoſed this expedient for accommodating us to the Laws, that our preſent Impoſitions might be required of us only in the matter and the End; that is, if we can come up to them ſo far as to agree in the chief ſubſtance of the thing enjoyned, and anſwer the end of the Impoſer, it ſhould ſuffice, though we expreſſed our Conſent in our own words. This would make our Subſcriptions eaſy, and every one could tell what to do for himſelf: but ſuppoſing that this will not be granted, I am put againſt my will upon this curioſity.

Let

Let us ſuppoſe then an Expoſition made of any Injunction according to the meaning of the Law-giver. If I aſſent to *all* of it, I may ſubmit to it, and need no favour: If I aſſent to *part* of it and not to *all*, I muſt have the favour to make my Limitation: If there be any Clauſe in it that I cannot aſſent at all unto, *I* muſt have leave to put in my Exception, or *I* cannot ſubmit to it. In the firſt caſe, when an *Interpretation* alone does ſerve me, *I* may Subſcribe to an impoſition *in the form of words* wherein it is enjoyned; and ſo long as *I* can do ſo, *I* may offer my interpretation for the avoiding of Scandal whether the Miniſters of the Law are willing or not, they muſt receive me. In the laſt caſe; when an *Exception* is needfull, *I* cannot (*I* think) Subſcribe to the form of words without prevaricating with the Law, and they that Adminiſter the Impoſition may (and *I* ſuppoſe will) refuſe me the licenſe of uſing my own expreſſions: In the middle caſe, wherein *I* have need of a *Limitation* (which I account leſs than an *Exception*, and more than an *Interpretation*) *I* may Subſcribe (*I* think) to the *words*, becauſe there is a truth in the words with my ſenſe, and my ſenſe is the meaning of the Law-giver; only becauſe *I* cannot ſubſcribe to *all* their meaning, *I* muſt have favour to expreſs my *Limitations*, or reſtraint of the words to that ſenſe, or elſe *I* cannot Subſcribe them (*I* account) with faithfulneſs: but if *I* have the liberty to do ſo, *I* am (*I* think) to ſteel my mind againſt all Scruple; and if any comes into it, to caſt it out. The Conſideration of that one Text alone *Be not righteous overmuch*, will bear me out (*I* apprehend) in ſuch a Subſcription.

To be yet Clearer, if *I* can be poſſible, If by a *Liberty of my own Senſe* (which *I* ſuppoſe the Biſhop will give me) he ſhall underſtand my giving the ſenſe of the Law, or declaring what I believe to be the meaning of the Law-giver, and then Subſcribing to the Impoſition in that Senſe, which is a proper *Interpretation*, here is no advantage to me, or favour, but what *I* may take my ſelf: If he ſhall underſtand my declaring a ſenſe of my own, though *I* believe it not to be the Senſe of the Impoſer, this is a great favour; but *I* ſee not how *I* can then Subſcribe to the *words* of the Impoſition, and he will not give me leave for all this, to Subſcribe in any other *form*: If he ſhall underſtand my Subſcribing ſo far as *I* can to the ſenſe in the words enjoyned, with liberty of Reſtriction of them to this meaning (which vertually includes an Exception againſt what *I* cannot aſſent unto), here *I* do humbly believe

lieve both, that I may Conſcionably Subſcribe, and he be ſatisfied in the matter. If we be tyed to the Meaning of the Law-giver every jot, the way is too *Streight*: To frame to our ſelves any Meaning without Regard to the Law giver's, is a Way too *Wide*: But to Subſcribe to the Meaning of the Impoſer ſo far as I can, and to forbear in what I cannot, is the Way which I think ſafe, and which I ſeek in this Paper. Only I muſt add one thing after this, that where there is no Form of Words impoſed, the Liberty of a *Limitation* and of an *Exception* comes to one; and as I now diſtinguiſh theſe *two Words*, I may again confound them, according to my occaſion.

Having thus diſtinguiſhed then between an *Interpretation* and a *Limitation* or *Exception*, I muſt yet proceed ſo far as I do go, to apply the ſame to my preſent Subſcription, that I may avoid all miſtake and ambiguity, and Conſequently the laying a ſtumbling block before any.

In the firſt Clauſe I do not Subſcribe to the propoſition which it contains *Univerſally* but *Indefinitely*, To wit, with the *Reſtriction* of it to ſuch a prudential ſtate of the queſtion as may be gathered out of ſuch Authors I have named. It becomes a *Loyall Subject* to Subſcribe that Tenet, and it becomes an *Honeſt-man* to Subſcribe it no further, or no otherwiſe, than ſuch learned and excellent perſons upon ſtudy, were able to maintain it. There are ſeveral caſes which are put by themſelves by way of Limitation of it, yet ſo long as we may believe, that none of them came into the Minds of the Majority of Parliament in paſſing the Law, and there were Actually none of them as could be put in regard to our preſent King, we are to look upon it as the Intent of the Act, that we ſhould conſequently object no ſuch Caſes to our ſelves in Subſcribing to this Clauſe; ſo that, though I here uſe my Liberty of *Reſtriction* in regard to *Others* (which I muſt tell) I might be content my ſelf (as I ſuppoſe in the *Oxford-Oath*) with an *Interpretation* only. Nay, I do not need any of this Caution at all, in regard to Soveraign Majeſty it ſelf, but in regard to thoſe that are at his Commandment. For, let me underſtand by *Taking Arms*, the Raiſing an Army, or a War (which I take to be the true Senſe in Conſtruction of Law), and by *the King*, his own Sacred Perſon only: There is no Caſe I know, but I may Subſcribe, That to take Arms againſt the King is *Univerſally* Unlawful.

In

In the Second Clauſe I am more fully perſwaded, that I do offer the true Senſe of the Acts, Of *Uniformity*, and that at *Oxford* in reference to the Poſition which is Renounced; and I am ſorry at my Heart to ſee it poſſible for ſo many of Judgment and Temper as there are, to be capable of any ſuch Pre-occupation of Mind, as to harbour once the Thought of another Interpretation, which cannot be made but by ſuppoſing it the very Intent of the Parliament in thoſe Acts, to advance an *Arbitrary* Authority in the King above the true *Regal* Power he hath by *Law*: And yet hath the late Diſcourſes of People about the *Teſt* and later Matters, with Stories thereunto appertaining, brought ſuch a *Jaundiſe* on our Imaginations, that makes every thing look *Yellow* and *Jealouſly* to us, as we even quite forget that the Meaning of theſe Acts is, and muſt be, the Senſe, Mind, or Purpoſe of the Parliament, or Major Part of both Houſes *at the time* when they paſſed them, and that is, when there was not the leaſt Breath of any ſuch thing as an *Arbitrary Government* talked of, or ſuſpected by any. It is plain enough, there was in the Prevailing Part, (I ſay not in the Major Number, which is againſt Reaſon and Charity to think) an inveterate Reſolution to ſuppreſs one ſort of Men they hated, which are now the Non-conformiſts, and that indeed was all the Plot in that time which was going. For let us ſuppoſe ſuch a Queſtion had bin propoſed at the paſſing theſe Acts, Whether the King ſhould have a Power for the time to come, to raiſe Money and make Laws without a Parliament? Can any Man's Heart ſerve him to believe, that ſuch a Motion would have bin entertained, or ſuch a Vote by any Means under Heaven have bin obtained (or could be yet) from the *Majority* of both Houſes? To put the Queſtion, Whether by *thoſe Commiſſionated* by the King in this Clauſe of the *Subſcription*, and that of the *Oxford-Oath*, is meant any but the *Legally Commiſſionated*, or ſuch as can juſtify their Commiſſions and Actings by Law, is all one in good earneſt with the Knowing, as to put *this ſaid* Queſtion. And how then does any Man that underſtands (and conſiders that he underſtands) himſelf, make a doubt of my Interpretation? It hath bin talked, that when it was endeavoured by ſome in the Upper Houſe, to put the Word *Legally* into the *Teſt* at the time when *that* was in Agitation, it was refuſed: But what of that, ſuppoſing it were true? Muſt this be the Reaſon on Neceſſity, becauſe they intended to make the Government Arbitrary? I am given to underſtand, *for certain*,

certain, that when this Clause came into motion, they did unanimously Vote, that by the *Commissionated*, the *Legally Commissionated*, and nothing else was to be understood, without any Contradiction: So that the Reason why they put not in that Word, *Legally*, could not be because they had another Meaning, but because this Meaning was so manifest, so undoubted, and yielded by all, that there was no need to do it; As also, lest by the Insertion of more than needs, they might give occasion to People for the time to come of questioning still the *Legality* of the King's *Commissions*. So easily are we misled by *Reports*, which are always *Partial*, & often *mistaken*. Nay, what if it were in the Thoughts of some *Court Flatterers*, who are not alwayes the *King's Friends*, to advance the *Prerogative* above its due Height? Did we not see, that as soon as this Suspition did but enter in the Thoughts of a few, what a stir it made, and the Test was fain to be laid down? And besides, that this Test was but in the Upper House only, there is no force at all in the Argument, what a few Men at *such a distance* were contriving (if they were): so long as it is not to be imagined that the Major Part of both Houses, *at the time* when the Acts were made, had the least Intention, or Thought of any such matter. I will add, that I am assured for my own part by certain Testimony, that the King himself hath said it more than once, not only in his Publick Speeches which may be thought Popular, but in his Private Retirement upon apt Occasions, that he really desired and sought no more than his just Prerogative, without Intrenchment on the Peoples Liberty. As he *needed not*, so he *would not* have said this to some upon the Occasion I know, if he was not Cordial in it. And if he should be of another Mind more lately (which it were a Wickedness in us to think), yet were that nothing as to the Acts of Parliament which have bin so long passed. Nay, that I may cut off this very Suggestion also, *Duke Lauderdale* in his Speech to the Convention of Estates at *Edenburgh*, now most lately, *July* 1678. hath these Words. *His Majesty hath these Eighteen Years in all his Kingdoms, solemnly professed his Abhorrence of Arbitrary Government, his Ruling by the Law, and his Inviolable Care to preserve the Liberty and Property of his Subjects.* I should not, I must confess, inculcate this thus much, but in regard to the *Oxford-Oath*, and that the *Conscience* of a Man is indeed as tender a Point as the *Throne* of a *King*. For, as for this *Subscription* alone, if any can be of another mind yet, he may put

put in his Particular Exception, and ſay, I Subſcribe to it as unlawful to *Reſiſt* any Commiſſionated by the King, if their Commiſſions be according to Law: if they be not, I hold the contrary.

In the Third Clauſe I have one thing to remember, which is to declare, that I apprehend not that any Man by his Subſcribing to *conform to the Liturgy*, does engage, or ſtand engaged becauſe of that, to forſake his Brethren preſently who conform not, and come no more amongſt them; or that he does debar himſelf thereby the Benefit to hear them, or deprive others of his Labours to Preach with them, at leaſt if ſome of the Common-Prayer will but be ſuffered to be read by him. I underſtand no ſuch matter by it: if any others do, I enter my Exception. For, as I am one that have ordinarily gone to my Pariſh-Church, not only joyning in the Publick Prayers, but receiving the Sacrament there, and never yet elſewhere, though I am a Non-conformiſt: So, if I ſhall conform (that is, ſo far as I can (which does but fix me ſo much more firm in that wherein I conform not), I intend not but to be the ſame Man ſtill, as to the keeping in with my Brethren, and to do as I did; which is to be ſometimes with them, and for the moſt part with the Parochial Congregation. I am convinced, that it is a great Fault of the Non-conformiſt and Conformiſt both, who fear God, that they keep no more Fellowſhip with one another, which were the neareſt way to make up Differences, and to underſtand better what is to be done by both for the Peace of the Church, and for the Sake of our Religion. And here I muſt advance a little in this Clauſe; I think it enough for a Licenſe to Preach, to Subſcribe the ſame with the mentioned Limitations: but if I ſhould find in my heart to take upon me a Parochial Charge, it were more fit, and in order to that Work, to Subſcribe more ſtrictly. In ſhort, So far as I *Aſſent* and *Conſent*, ſo far *I* can ſay, *I will Conform*. For this is uniforme, and that I may be expreſs in what I do, becauſe it ſtands me upon; I am come to an Agreement, upon Treaty, to change this Clauſe thus, which differs little in the Import.

The Third Clauſe is a Promiſe, as I take it, to Read Common Prayer, which I am not againſt; and do therefore Subſcribe, That if I have a Publick Charge, or Cure of Souls, *I ſhall* in the ordinary Lord's-Day Service, by my ſelf, or by an Aſſiſtant, according to the Uſage of the

Church, *conform to the Liturgy of the Church of* England *as it is now by Law Eſtabliſhed.* Only, if upon any occaſion (or Reaſon) I ſhall ſometimes ſhorten the Work, I will not be held a Breaker of my Promiſe for that: Nor ſhall the Omiſſion of another, be laid to my Charge.

In the Fourth Clauſe there is ſome Diſtinction, and my Reſtrictions or Limitation on that Diſtinction. I will add here ſome few Words for Explication of the Reſtrictions. I do ſay, there lyes no *Obligation* from the *Covenant* on *any Perſon* [in a Private Capacity, or Acting in a Private Capacity] *to endeavour any Alteration of Government.* By which Words I underſtand not only an *Exception* to ſuch who are Publick Perſons that Act in Parliament, which I expreſs in the firſt Words [*in a Private Capacity*] but to all others likewiſe, Acting in ſuch a way, as (or in no other way than) is warrantable by the Conſtitution of the Land, which I expreſs in the Word ſuperadded [or *Acting in a private Capacity*]. The *Government* of this Nation is a *Mixt* Government, and there is ſomething of it in the Hands of the *Popularity.* The People may chooſe their Repreſentatives for Parliament, and tell them what they would have done, and perſwade them to endeavour it, and Petition both Houſes for it (nay, they Vote in them), and in all this, Act, I count in a *Publick Capacity* though *Private Perſons*, ſo long as they do Act by *Vertue* of the *Conſtitution.* I muſt *account* likewiſe, if any ſeek the *Reformation of the Church*, or any other Good for the Nation, in *Praying* to God for it, or *Preaching* (ſuppoſe one Preaching to the Houſes) and *Perſwading* to it, and the like (if you ſcrue up the Word *Endeavour* to that Height), with the purpoſe only of having it done in an orderly way, by a due Proceeding in Parliament, *that this is to be held Equivalent*, becauſe whatſoever is done this way, is warranted (I ſay) by the Conſtitution. I dare not then deny, but there does lye an Obligation on every Man in the *Parliament* as *Publick Perſons*, and on all *Private Perſons* likewiſe, ſo far as they can act in a *Publick Capacity* therunto, to Honour God, in ſeeking the Reformation of the Church, and the Publick Good: But I Subſcribe, that there lyes no Obligation from the Covenant upon *my ſelf or any other Perſon*, to endeavour the ſame any otherwiſe but in a *Political Capacity* that is only as it can be obtained by a Rightful Act of Parliament. If any think, I have not expreſſed thus much aptly or fully

fully enough in its place, let him mend it to his own Mind who has occasion for it: It suffices me, (as I have for the general once intimated) if I have here and there together (as Master of my own Sense and Explanations), delivered my self from Scruple.*

In the *Fifi* Clause, I do the like as in the *fourth*, and then give my reason why I Subscribe upon the Restriction. I dare not say that nothing in the Covenant is Lawfull or Obligatory, They covenanted against Schisme, Popery, to Repent and amend their lives; This must oblige those that took it. Nay I dare not say that it is *unlawfull* to make *any change of Government*. The power of the Keyes is committed by Christ to the Minister, or his own Officers; The Bishop commits them to the Chancellour, who is a Lay man, and yet executes that Charge. Who does doubt but if the Government were changed in this point, it were *lawfull*? Nay I do not say that a *change* of the *Hierarchy* it self, of the Arch-bishop and Diocesan Bishop invested with the sole power of Ordination and Juridiction into the *Primitive Episcopacy*, acting along in these things with the Presbyters, is *in it self unlawfull*, but that it lyes in the power of a Parliament (if they please) to do it. When I do then thus put in my exception as to the *Matter Covenanted* (even the Alteration of Government) *precisely considered*, and rest my self only in shewing how this Oath in the *Act of Covenanting* was indeed in the *Complex consideration* (in regard to that matter) obviously *unlawfull* as I judge, and give my Reason: if this shall content the Bishop and serve my turn, I may have cause to acknowledge his candour, but none of my brethren have any, to be offended at me for what I do.

In the last Clause I find no need of any Exception or Interpretation.

That which remaines therefore now in regard to this Subscription, is only to put my hand to my Paper, which if I obtain hereby the use of my Ministry (and none can convince me of sin in it) I am content to do: If I obtain it not, it shall suffice me to have made the tryal, and the matter shall be all one in point of Conformity between God and my* soul, as if I were clear altogether, and had put no name at all to it. *J. H.*

Thus much then for the Subscription. *I* have offered my *Rule* and *I* have proceeded to *Practise*; which *I* have done in the *General*, and in this *Particular*. *I* have no more to say of that. Of

the former, the *General*, there are ſeveral branches mentioned before, and there are ſome of them wherein *I* perceive it neeedfull to make yet ſome further declaration; more eſpecially, Concerning the Common Prayer, Concerning my Second Orders, and Concerning the Church Articles. And when *I* have alſo done this, my work is not quite done, *I* have ſomething to leáve then (if it might be obtained) on other hands.

For the firſt, the *Common Prayer*. There are many particular things, little and great, in ſome part or other of the book, which *I* muſt profeſſe really *I* cannot give my unfained aſſent and conſent unto, and think, that any man who is ſevere at any time upon his Conſcience, can hardly chooſe but be ſtartled at. *I* remember ſome years ſince, a Conformiſt Miniſter uſing the Common Prayer in his houſe, gave me this reaſon. It was required (he ſaid) of all Miniſters, and turned me preſently to this paſſage in the Preface before the Prayers. *And all Prieſts and Deacons are to ſay dayly the Morning and Evening prayer, either privately or openly, not being let by ſickneſs, or ſome other urgent cauſe.* From that time, *I* perceived *I* was no man for the Declaration of Aſſent and Conſent to all, and every thing, contained in, and preſcribed by this book; and alſo that by the ſhift of thoſe words [to the uſe] *I* could not help my ſelf. *I* dare not give my conſent to the uſe of any thing which *I* never intend to do. I do, and *I* ſhall uſe at home my own Prayers. In the other Preface before Ordination, there is a difference of *Order* (or *Office*) aſſerted between Biſhop and Presbyter (which was put in alſo in this new book on purpoſe) when ſuch men as *Field*, *Maſon*, *Davenant*, *Mead*, *Uſher*, do hold a difference in *Degree* only. *I* cannot aſſent to this, becauſe *I* was otherwiſe engaged in print before this book was enjoyned, and *I* cannot retract my opinion without conviction. In the ſame place, there is this paſſage, but with more words. *And to the intent that theſe Orders be reverendly eſteemed, no man ſhall be accounted or taken for a Lawfull Prieſt, or be ſuffered to execute the function, except he be called according to this forme, or hath had formerly Epiſcopal Ordination.* Reader, can thy heart conſent to this? Art thou ſo aſſured that the nation lies under no guilt in turning out ſo many Miniſters who were Ordained only by Presbyters, as thou dareſt partake in the deed by thy Conſent? My heart *I* am ſure will not ſerve me to do it. In the *Athanaſian* Creed *I* cannot aſſent to the Proeme and Concluſion.

ſion by no means, and God forbid they ſhould be true. The whole Creed and Articles of it I believe, but *I* believe not that every one that don't, is uncapable of Salvation. *I* will mention one more peculiar thing (and it is a great matter) that ſticks with me being againſt my *written* judgement. *I* perceive the Liturgy through all its Offices does lay the Notion of the Church upon ſo narrow a foundation as the Congregationall men do, and *I* think that without ſome other Hypotheſis, we cannot defend our ſelves againſt Separation. It is not upon the Chriſtian profeſſion in general in oppoſition to other Religions, but upon the profeſſion of no leſs than a true ſaving faith the child is baptized, when the Sureties in the name of it ſelf, and not of its Parents, do anſwer actually, *Credo*, *Abrenuncio*; Having thus profeſſed faith or repentance, it is ſaid to be *Regenerate* in the Office performed; Upon the ſame profeſſion renewed, when the child comes to more years, it is *Confirmed*; No man is then admoniſhed, or preſumed to be allowed, to come to the Sacrament but upon an *aſſured faith*; And none are burried but according to a Church judgement of Charity (as *Profeſſours*), they are, and muſt be *accounted*, to go to Heaven. *I* cannot tell well how to reliſh this, for here is no bottom methinks for a National Church. *I* muſt have ſuch a Notion of the Church (Catholick, National, Parochicall) as a *Polliceor* according to the Catechiſme may ſerve for a perſons entrance into it, and all the Ordinances of Worſhip and Diſcipline be means after to *excite* him unto *grace* and his duty, as well as to *edify* him when he is holy unto Salvation. This is no place *I* know for ſuch a diſcourſe; Only *I* am not willing to be *Choaked* in it, by ſwallowing this *Pear* of Aſſent and Conſent. In the Orders of Deacon *I* never approved ſince my ſelf was faulty, that a man does Solemnly promiſe to performe that Office (the duties hereof being read to him) when he is made Prieſt alſo at the ſame time, and immediately caſts off that Charge. In the Rubricks to the Communion, Baptiſme, and Burial, if *I* conſent to every thing preſcribed, or to the uſe of every thing there preſcribed, I muſt not deliver the Bread and Wine to a man, if he ſcruples to Kneel at the Sacrament; *I* muſt turn away his child from baptiſme, if he ſcruples God-fathers; and if the Child dies before it is Chriſtened, though the parents be my dear friends, *I* muſt not allow it Chriſtian burial. Theſe are hard Inſtances in my mind, and *I* could eaſily make up the number twenty, which *I* believe the indifferent Reader would count reaſonable exceptions.

I muſt diſtinguiſh therefore (as *I* here carefully do) the Ordinary appointed Prayers, and Service of the Liturgy, from other Matters on the *By*; which *I* declare no Aſſent or Conſent unto. And when I come in, or ſeek to come in to the Church upon the terms of *Moderation*, I do declare my ſelf *Ipſo facto* a Nonconformiſt ſtill to the *Severity* of theſe Impoſitions; bearing indeed thereby, only a more diſtinct, fixed and aſſured teſtimony againſt them. Nevertheleſs being ſenſible of the Scandal which is given to the Nation, who ſee generally no other difference between us but our refuſing to read the Common Prayer, and do think us very exceeding refractory perſons who will not comply in the things we can do, I do reſolve for one, by the grace of God (without turning to the *left hand* in doing any thing which is againſt my conſcience for preferment, or to the *right* in contenting my ſelf with Suffering only and doing nothing), to ſet my ſelf as it were in the *Market place*, and if any Biſhop ſhall give me a *call* (that is fitting) into the *Vineyard* (when I ſeek to them) upon the termes of this Paper, I ſhall not refuſe them, though it be almoſt the Eleventh hour with me. I ſhall not ſtick out with them I believe upon the account of reading Common Prayer. I will truſt in Gods *power*, if he hath work for me to do that he will give me *aſſiſtance* to do it: and if they will not let me come in upon theſe termes to *Labour*, I will truſt in his *Goodneſs* that he will forgive me when I am found *Idle*. The Nation ſhall ſee at whoſe door the fault Lyes by my experiment. For I do profeſſe my ſelf one who can neither ſtretch my Soul beyond its ſtaple, nor yet will give off upon deſpondence, or on the preſumption onely that it will not ſerve me unleſs I do every thing to a tittle, which is the prepoſſeſſed judgment of moſt of my brethren when they have made no tryal, and which I would humbly reprove therefore by my Example.

For the Second, *Re-ordination*. I will here make my Remonſtrance and Confeſſion. I will ſet things at rights between God and my Soul, and between my Soul and the World. I am one that was ordained by Presbyters in the late times, and re-ordained ſince by the Biſhop. I was perſwaded into it before I had ſtudied the point, and brought my ſelf in diſtreſs. I was fain to take ſuch a courſe for relief of my Soul, as nothing could have drove me to, but that diſtreſs it ſelf, which I would not lye under again for the World. Not that I was any ways touched in my In-

Intellectuals by it, as ſome that never knew me have bin apt to talk ever ſince, which I muſt aſſure them is a *tale*, and there was no ſuch thing (*I* thank God) in the *leaſt*. *I* have reaſon yet to ſay this, becauſe *I* know the temper of my mind being Melancholy and Thoughtful, and ſo apt to be intent on any one thing that hath got into it, whether of Notion or Buſineſs, *I* do not often, and *I* cannot ſomtimes recall my ſelf from thoſe thoughts to an attendance on the preſent company *I* am in, or diſcourſe that is going ſo freely as others, which makes my unheedfulneſs lyable to the cenſure of thoſe that are not uſed to me; Beſides that, being One reſolved generally to follow my own conſcience in what *I* write, or do, whether it pleaſe or diſpleaſe others, the Offended (who are commonly on both ſides) may be apt to put ſome ſuch ſlur upon me, at leaſt, while in any thing *I* go but in a way uncommon. As *Paul* therefore ſaid, when *Feſtus* had got ſuch a conceit of him, ſo muſt *I*. *I am not Mad* my worthy Brethren who are ſtrangers to me, when *I* differ from you, (and from thoſe alſo, whom *I* do know) in what *I* write, or act: But what *I do* (*I* truſt) are deeds of *Soberneſs*, and *I ſpeak forth the words of Truth*. *I* acknowledge, the Church in her giving Orders does intend the collation of an Office to the Presbyter diſtinct from the Biſhop, that is an office without the power of Ordination; and conſequently if a Presbyter ordains any, the Church-men muſt hold ſuch an ordination to be void, becauſe the perſons that conſer the orders have no power to do it. But *I* muſt confeſs my thoughts about Orders are ſomthing different from others. *I* do not think that the Spiritual power, or miniſterial authority is conveyed to us by the hands of any, but does come *Immediately* upon us (the conditions on our part being put) from the inſtitution of Chriſt. *I* apprehend conſequently that whatſoever be the intention of the Church in her giving Orders, ſuch a power muſt be derived from Chriſt to the perſon ordained as is intended in his Inſtitution: and ſo long as we find not any diſtinction (which is touched before) of Order or Office (though we allow one as to Degree and Eminency) in the Scripture between *Biſhop* and *Presbyter*, the authority of one in regard to God muſt be the ſame with the other; and the laying on the hands of the one be of the ſame validity in Ordination as the impoſition of the hands of the other. We do read, that God hath *ſet in his Church*, *Apoſtles*, *Evangeliſts*, *Paſtors and Teachers*, but we find not *Biſhop and Presbyter*

lyter enumerated as *two* of them. *I* enter not into diſpute here, but *I* am one that dare not give way to the making void of my Miniſtry and all my Miniſterial acts for a dozen years, or more, before *I* was Ordained by the Biſhop, for that were a heynous crime for me (*I* think) to do: yet will *I* be content as to the *Exerciſe* of my Office now, to own my authority from him. *I* was a Miniſter before *in foro Dei & Conſcientiæ*: *I* was made a Miniſter then (*I* will account) *in foro Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ*. *I* acknowledge *I* did ill in my circumſtances to take ſecond orders: and yet was *I* too extream (*I* doubt) in my renunciation, or in the way of my renunciation again of them. If any man thinks that Orders give the ſpiritual power, and makes us Miniſters *in foro Dei*, it is apparent that a Man who is a Miniſter already cannot be ſo made a Miniſter again. Conſequently if *I* have formerly writ any thing that ſeems to countenance *Re-ordination* to the *Office* (which in good earneſt my Hypotheſes never favoured) *I* do rennounce it all, and thoſe ſecond Orders, on that account (*I* humbly crave the Churches abſolution and benediction): But if Orders be onely a *Recommendation of us to the grace of God for the work* unto which a man is called, there is nothing in Re-ordination to ſcare any; and as my ſecond Orders may ſerve me for the Exerciſe of my Miniſtry when my firſt will not, *I* do, *I* muſt, retain them to that purpoſe, if *I* be received (on my termes otherwiſe) into the Church. *I* crave pardon of God for my failings on either hand, eſpecially where my eaſe in the work crept in to deflour my Sincerity in ſuch a peice of Self-denyall as I know elſe what was. The prevailing intereſt of my heart (I hope) was right in the ſight of God in what I did, yet dare I not juſtfie my ſelf, but commit my caſe unto my Judge, imploring his mercy and begging his pardon. For when there is nothing almoſt that I do, but upon a ſevere Examination I can find ſome flaws in it my ſelf: If *thou O Lord, ſhould'ſt be extream to mark againſt me what I have done amiſſe*, how could I abide it? I will bind my ſelf therefore (If I be fit) ſo much more to my duty, and in ſome kind of pennance for my infirmity, ſhall be the more content that I take this courſe to make my return to the Vineyard as no man elſe hath endeavoured, at leaſt in ſuch a *Manifeſto* as this is. And to the ſame end, *I* ſhall yet commit this enſuing Memoriall to Poſterity.

Notum ſit omnibus ad quos hæc ſpectant, me J. H. legitime

&

& Canonice ab Epiſcopo Bathonienſi ordinatum fuiſſe; Quod cùm prægrave nimium Conſcientiæ meæ ob priorem aliquam Ordinationem à Presbyteris ſine Epiſcopo collatam viſum eſt: Ordinationem hanc denuò receptam non ad Miniſterij Officium, ſed ad ejus Exercitium particulare, ubicunq; vocatus (ſi vocatus) fuero, habendi; eaq; habita utendi, egomet mihi, & Deus meus (facillime omnia in quibus peccavi mihi condonans) poteſtatem facimus.

For the third, the *Nine and Thirty Articles*. I muſt confeſs my ſelf in this one thing ſomething more difficult to be ſatisfied than others. *It* is but diſtinguiſhing of the *Doctrine* and *Diſcipline* of the Church (which includes the Government and Ceremonies), and the moſt of my Brethren can Subſcribe to theſe Articles without Scruple. And no more than an Aſſent to the *Doctrine* (*I* think) is required by the Statute. But *I* am one much in doubt concerning the *Doctrine* of ſome of our *Articles*. *I* do think that the Article of *Juſtification*, and the *Eighteenth* Article in the Authentick ſenſe of them are queſtionable. Theſe words in the Eleventh Article, *That we are Juſtified by Faith only*, are expreſly contrary to the meaning of *St. James*: And the *meaning* of thoſe that compoſed the Articles at that time (who had not the Light which is going now) was I believe contrary alſo to the *meaning* of St. *James*: Their miſtake I apprehend Obvious, who took St. *Pauls* juſtification, *by Faith without the Works of the Law* to be all one as *by Faith only*. In the Eighteenth Article likewiſe I believe it was the judgment, and ſo the meaning of the Compoſers, that no man who is not converted to the Chriſtian Faith can be ſaved, and conſequently that every Heathen Man in the World muſt periſh. For this is conſonant to the beginning and end of the *Athanaſian* Creed, that whoſoever *believes* not that *faithfully*, and *keeps* it *whole* and *undefiled* is *undoubtedly* Damn'd. But for my own part, I cannot be of this Opinion, which ſeems to me inconſiſtent with the Goodneſs of God, and Natural Religion. I have offered ſome little Light and Argument for the ſalvability of ſome Heathen (in my Book lately come out, entituled *Peaceable Diſquiſitions*) that will not, or cannot (I think) be withſtood by the Conſiderate and Equal. I have offered alſo in the ſame book that reconciliation of *Paul* and *James* which I believe to be the Right. I can believe no otherwiſe, and I muſt have liberty therefore of ſome exception

in theſe two Articles (and perhaps in ſome others) from that which I believe to be the Authentick Senſe of them, or I cannot Subſcribe them. Nay, to ſay ſomething that may ſeem ſtrange, I can ſubſcribe the *words* of one of theſe Articles, and yet not to the *article* (without diſpenſation) becauſe I think the *meaning* of the Impoſers to be more than the *words* come to. I verily think the Compoſers of the Articles did believe that all Heathen are excluded Salvation, yet do they proceed to their Anathema here (which they have in no other Article) with *wary* words, which is not pronounced againſt any that ſay only *ſome Heathen may be ſaved*, but againſt them *who preſume to ſay that every Man ſhall be ſaved by the Law or Sect he profeſſeth, ſo that he be diligent to frame his Life according to it*, which is a Doctrine *I* abhor my ſelf as being againſt the ſenſe of what *I* offer in my Book nam'd; the ſcope whereof is to ſhew, that there is but one Rule, Law, or Religion for the World to obtain Life by; That this is the Law of our Lapſed Nature, which is God's Grace adminiſtred under a threefold State; Of the *Heathen*, Of the *Jews*, Of *Chriſtians*; That our *Advantage* over them lyes (as the Apoſtle ſpeaks) in our having *the Oracles of God*, which (including the Miniſtry and Ordinances) are (we know) thoſe further (and our ordinary) Means which they have not, to bring Men up to the *Performance* of that Law, that is the Condition to us and them of obtaining Salvation by it. This makes that Advantage ſo ſignificant, that in compariſon of the ſtate of the *Jews* (or *Common-Wealth of Iſrael*) and much more in compariſon of *our* Eſtate; the Heathen wanting theſe means, are ſaid to be *dead in their Sins*, to be *without God*, *without Chriſt*, to *ſit in Darkneſs*, and the like, (that is (I ſay) *Comparatively to us*, or *Secundum quid*) when yet they are under the ſame Law (I affirm) in the *Subſtance* for Life as we, and we know not but more than a few of them live with acceptance up to it. When ſome Men will have *Chriſtians* ſaved only by *Morality* and *Good Nature*, it will be time, and no Fault for others, to make the *Heathens* Salvable by *Grace* and *Chriſt Jeſus*. This is not indeed here (or there) my *concern* to perſue: But that I have to obſerve to my preſent Purpoſe, is (as I am ſaying), that though I know none that do ſcruple the Literal Senſe of this Article, which is, That no Man can be ſaved *by any* Religion, but the *True* Religion; yet ſo long as I believe, that the Impoſers did mean more, to wit, that no Man can be Saved

ved *in any* Religion but the Christian, which is another Matter (As a Man may be Saved *in* Popery, but not *by* it; He may be saved *from* Popery, in Popery, and so *from* Idolatry *in* Heathenisme): I have bin in suspense still how to Subscribe this Article, unless it be only to the *Words*, with Exception to the *Authentick Meaning*. There is a threefold Interpretation, An *Authentick*, *Usual*, and *Doctrinal Interpretation*, as *Suarez* has it *De Legibus*. I will therefore advance here one Notion, which will be received (I think) as Consonant to the Judgment of most Men, as soon as they have laid it to Consideration. It is this, that though I account all Laws in general are to be taken in that Sense only, which we believe to be the Meaning of the Law-giver, because the Law is his Will, and it is not the Words, but his Meaning is his Will: Yet do I judge, that in these Articles of the Church, which are not *Laws*, nor Articles of *Faith*, but Articles for *Concord*, that is, in the Words of the Canon, *Articles for the avoiding Diversities of Opinions, and for establishing of Consent touching true Religion*, there is no Man to be staked down to the *Authentick* Interpretation (which I account that, as a Man believes to be the Meaning of the Majority of the Convocation that passed the Article), but to be allowed (or rather, he is supposed to be allowed, and to take) the Freedome of a *Doctrinal* Interpretation (which is, any Judicious Explication of such a *Thesis* or Doctrine, as some of the Eminent Doctors of the Church, or other Pious and Learned Author or Authors have offered to the Nation; or indeed any such as a Man himself shall tender, which in the *Literal Grammatical* Construction of the Article (to keep to the King's Declaration before the Articles) appears Rational, and is satisfactory to his own Conscience, and much more if it be allowed by the Bishop). My Reason is, because it must be conceived, that when any Council, Synod, or Convocation of Divines do meet about an Agreement upon any Articles or *Theses* concerning Religion, they are generally of divers Minds in the debating the Points, and every one is to be supposed free in the Delivery of his Judgment, until they come to draw up the Article or Doctrine into such Words as they are all to consent to; and then if it be Composed so, as they can yield to one another in the *Words* which they agree upon, it is to be understood, that there is an Universal Allowance tacitly granted from all to one another, of abounding in their own Sense, and so they came to a Coalition. There is the Mean-

ing then of the *Majority*; and a *Universal* Meaning. The *Universal* Meaning is above the Meaning of the *Major Part*. The Meaning of the *Majority* I believe in some of these Articles, to be such as I cannot Subscribe them in their Meaning: But forasmuch, as I apprehend it the *Universal* Meaning, that every one of those that are to pass their Vote in Establishing the Article, should have the Liberty of his own Sense, so long as he can but agree with the rest in the Words, or in the Literal Construction of the Article, if I bring an Interpretation of some Doctor, or one of my own, which may be supposed to be the same with any one of them who so consented to it with difference of Explication from others, then must I be supposed to have the Universal Allowance of the Convocation for that Interpretation, which I call a Doctrinal Interpretation. I will confirm this by the Notoriety of the Practise in the Council of *Trent*. The Doctors differed in most Points, but as soon as (through the Expertness of one of the Presidents, famous for that Knack) they were but put into Words as might salve their contrary Opinions, they passed their Votes as Unanimous in the Council, although they writ after also one against another, citing the Council for them on both sides. To this purpose are the Words of the King, in his Declaration for the Ratification of the Articles to be considered, *We take Comfort in this, that even in those curious Points, in which the present Differences lye, Men of all sorts take the Articles of the Church of* England *to be for them.* The *Arminians* with Doctor *Hammond*, and the *Calvinists* with Bishop *Usher* do Subscribe them, and find out their own different Sense in them. I will leave it therefore on the File, as the fit Matter of a new Canon, if ever we have another Convocation, to be declared, that the Articles and Homilies of the Church are imposed, and to be Subscribed, not in the *Authentick*, nor in the *Usual*, but in a *Doctrinal* Interpretation. There being a Latitude in all Controverted Points, and consequently some Diversity of Opinion to be allowed to Brethren, for the abounding in their own Sense in the same Religion, or else there can be no sufficient Foundation of Unity amongst any considerable Number of Men of Free Judgments in the World.

In the mean time, if the case be put, what a man shall do that scruples or doubts of the truth of any of the Articles, whether he may satisfie himself with such an Interpretation before it be Autho-

Authorized by a Convocation (or otherwiſe), I muſt anſwer that *I* apprehend a great deal of reaſon for it, but dare not paſs ſuch a determination. If *I* ſcruple any thing my ſelf *I* ſhall declare it, and unleſs *I* am ſatisfied in that ſenſe of the point as *I* believe was the meaning of the Impoſers, *I* muſt fly to my remedy, not of an *Interpretation*, but of the liberty for *Exception* or *Limitation*, and that indeed does my work. This Scrupuloſity, and rigour of my mind for avoiding every thing of a Solemne lie (though never ſo ſmall) does make me wiſh for ſuch a *Canon*, or the allowance of a *greater Authority*, by ſome Act of Parliament.

I will therefore now turn me to the Higher Powers, for I muſt beg their Pardon for this Endeavour of mine to make my return to the Vineyard before they have opened the way for us, who can alone Legally do it. I would hereby, kindly provoke them to think at laſt on ſome Explanatory Act for Uniting the Proteſtant, and reſtoring the Ejected; who have now been out of our Livings above Fifteen year, and no evil we hope hath been found in us, beſides our preaching ſometimes, and praying, and the keeping of our Conſciences. And becauſe it is ſaid, commonly by the Members of either Houſe, that if they knew what we would have, or thought we know our ſelves, they would do it; I cannot forbear to preſent them with the Materialls of ſuch a Bill, in telling them *what we would have*, from what is ſaid already; if they will but bear with the repetition. For when the obtainment of ſuch a bleſſing for the Nation is even near paſt my *hopes*, yet muſt it be ſtill in my *prayers*; I may not be wanting to it in my *endeavours*; and it cannot be beyond my *Wiſhes*.

Whereas then, there are many jealouſies aroſe about Popery (to frame a Preamble, as well as a body for ſuch a Bill out of what is before delivered,) which makes it even neceſſary to the peace of the Nation, that the Proteſtant intereſt be united and ſtrengthened by all good and lawfull means, and to this end there being this one proper expedient, to wit, the removing the occaſions of *Diviſion* which ſeveral perſons do find to themſelves in thoſe late injunctions which yet were intended to the ſame purpoſe of *Concord* in the Realm: *That which we would have*, is, that the Parliament would be pleaſed that a Bill be prepared for Peace and Union, which might bear ſome ſuch Title. *An Explanatory Act for agreement amongſt Proteſtants, and for Eaſe in the buſineſs in Religion.* In which Bill I would have ſuch an Explanation

nation of these Impositions, and such Alleviations in regard to the tenderly considerate, and peaceably Scrupulous, or, *soberly*, not *factiously* Conscientious (who will never be wonne) as may do our busines.

In the Act of Uniformity, By the Declaration of *Assent and Consent to all things, and every thing, contained in, and prescribed, by, the two books, of Common Prayer, and of Ordering Priests and Deacons*, there is no considerate man of the Parliament ever (I hope) understood that these books are in every minute particular infallible, or free from that defect which is incident to all humane Composures; but they understand I suppose, that they are in the maine contents to be sincerely approved and used: I *would have* it therefore be here sufficient, if this Declaration be made to the use of the book in the Ordinary dayly Lords-day service, which we can consent to, or that we may make it with a license of Exception against any matter or matters (out of that Service) which the Bishop shall think meet to be dispensed with upon Convincing reason; Provided only that the Ordinary constant publick Service of the Liturgy obtains Consent and Practise. And for the *Ceremonies*, which are, and have been always, and on all hands held only for *indifferent* things, *I wish* they might be left to the *Consciences* and prudence of Ministers and People every where (excepting the *Cathedralls*,) to *use* them, or *forbear* them as they judge it most meet for one anothers *edification*; for so some Bishops I believe, if it be left to them, will sometimes be apt to determine themselves. Provided that if any person will have his child baptized with the signe of the Cross, or stands upon any thing else hitherto required by the Service-book, if the Minister himself Scruple the performance, he shall alwayes have some Assistant or Curate to do it.

In the same Act, By the *Subscription*, before treated, As I believe there was no new Ill or strange thing intended by any of them, but the rightfull maintenance onely of the Kings Authority against Rebellion: So do I apprehend that the Interpretation and the Limitations which I do here humbly present with an unfeigned impartiality upon the several Clauses of it, may pass their publick approbation or allowance; which therefore *I would have* to be done, as a matter of kind *satisfaction* to *most* Mens consciences, and of *grievance* to *no* Body. Onely for that part of it which is enjoyned but to the year 1682, it might do better perhaps to be made

made to ceaſe preſently, and be no longer impoſed.

And foraſmuch as there is an Oath alſo in the Act of *Oxford* required of all Non conformiſt preachers that reſide in any Corporate town, or come within five Miles of it, whereof I have Printed a former Paper, and given the *Interpretation* throughout as I believed it to be the very ſenſe and meaning onely of the Act, without *limitation* or *exception*, which cannot therefore be refuſed, inſomuch as I dare, and do appeal to a Vote of the two Houſes whether I have delivered their minds or no: I would here have it onely put to the Queſtion; and if it be (as I doubt not) indeed their ſenſe, that they would declare it. This will make that Oath ſtreight be generally taken. Or elſe, I will propoſe this rather (which is better) that it may ſuffice any man to enjoy the right of this free-born liberty to go where he will in his own Country, I mean to eſcape the penalty of this Act, and ſerve him alſo inſtead of the forementioned Subſciption, to take that Oath in this form of words following. *I A. B. do ſwear, that I hold it unlawful upon any pretence to take Armes againſt the King, his Government, or Laws: And that I diſclaim that dangerous Poſition of taking Armes by his Authority againſt his Perſon, or any Legally commiſſionated by him in the Legal purſuit of ſuch Commiſſions: And that I will not endeavour any alteration of Government in the Church or State in any way or manner not warranted by the Conſtitution of this Kingdome (that is in a ſeditious manner), or any otherwiſe then by Act of Parliament.*

It being required moreover in the Act of uniformity (which is another of the things alſo before Mentioned) that every Miniſter who enjoyes any Living ſhall be ordained by a Biſhop, and there are ſeveral perſons of late who in caſe of neceſſity for want of Biſhops took Presbyterian Orders, *I would have* the Parliament declare it their intent (for redeeming their credit with the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas), not to make it abſolutely neceſſary for ſuch perſons to be *reordained to the Office*, but that it may be enough for them if they receive this ſecond Impoſition of hands to the *Exerciſe* of their Office in the *New charge* unto which they are, or ſhall be appointed, and that the Biſhop may, and ſhall frame his words accordingly. This is the only way that I could find out, for peace to my own mind (as I have told before) in this buſineſs.

And whereas there is a Subſcription alſo in the Canons and the Canonical

Canonical Oath of Obedience impoſed on moſt Miniſters by the Biſhops (mentioned before likewiſe), which have given ſome of the greateſt occaſion to Non-conformiſts heretofore, and which yet have never paſſed into a Law by any Act of Parliament: I would here have it enquired by what Authorty *one* of theſe is impoſed, for I know none; And for *that* which is found in the Canons, being what is more than needs, becauſe included in other injunctions, *I would have* it Exauthorized, and that nothing more of this nature might be impoſed on us than is made neceſſary by the Act of the thirteenth of *Elizabeth*. Provided nevertheleſs, if the Biſhop be unſatisfyed about any particular Perſon, he ſhall be ready to offer a due acknowledgment of his reverence to Biſhops in a laudible Teſtimony thereof under his hand, and of his fair regard to the main ſubſtance of the three Articles contained in that Canonicall Subſcription in ſuch expreſſions as ſhall beſt ſatisfy his own Conſcience, and be approved as ſufficient under the hands of two Epiſcopal Doctors, or allowed by the Biſhop.

And in regard there hath bin great offence taken by conſciencious Miniſters (which is a thing hath not yet bin mentioned) at the Biſhop, or his Courts commanding them to read the ſentence of Excommunication againſt ſome or other of their Pariſh, for ſuch faults as they think not at all worthy of ſo great cenſure, I *would fain have* here this Evil reformed, and that it be declared a juſt thing that every Miniſter be firſt ſatisfyed in the cauſe, or elſe be exempted from the execution of that charge; and that the Biſhop or his Court provide ſome other perſon that is ſatisfied about it, to do it. And I would have none forced to give the Body and Blood of Chriſt to any, but to whom they can, in point of Conſcience.

In the laſt place, To the intent that a free ſearch after Truth may be encouraged, and many other Scruples avoided upon that account: I would have them Authorize this one thing which I have offered, as more peculiar in this Paper; which is, That though an Authentick Interpretation, which is the Senſe and Meaning only of the Law-giver, be that Interpretation which is to be regarded as the Subſtance of all Laws, ſeeing no *Law*, as no *Scripture* is *of Private Interpretation:* yet in all matters of Words meerly and Phraſes, an Interpretation that is *Uſual*, and in all *Articles*, or *Theſes* for Concord (which I diſtinguiſh from *Laws*) about Religion, and the *Homilies* of the Church, a *Doctrinal* Interpre-

terpretation be ſufficient for an Aſſent or Subſcription to them.

These are the Things, and there is no leſs than theſe, and (I think) no more than theſe, which are neceſſary to reconcile the Moderate Conformiſt and Non-conformiſt, which is one Part of my Deſigne, an *Accommodation*. If they will pull out *Nine* Thorns out of our Feet, and leave a *Tenth*, we cannot go along with them. Be it reſolved therefore by the Grace of God, and both Houſes, that if any Perſon be willing to conform to the preſent Eſtabliſhment of the Church of *England*, and her Service appointed upon theſe, any of theſe, and every one of theſe Explanations, Alleviations, Declarations, Lenitives, or Cautions, he ſhall be admitted to any Eccleſiaſtical Preferment, and enjoy the uſe of his Miniſtry without Moleſtation. All Statutes, Canons, or Laws to the contrary notwithſtanding.

To paſs now to the other part of this Bill or Deſigne, which is *Indulgence*; In the way, Becauſe the very Superintendency of Biſhops, and that Subjection to them which is required by the Conſtitution of the Realm is, or may be, an Hindrance to many ſober Miniſters, and other Proteſtants of coming into the Church, who are ready to conſent to the *Doctrine*, but not to the *Diſcipline* or *Government* of it, I would have them declare, That ſo long as any Perſon or Party do acknowledge the King's Supremacy, as Head of the Church in this Nation, and obey their Ordinary *in licitis & honeſtis*, upon the account of his Authority committed to the Biſhops, and their Officers, as Subſtitutes of his for the Exerciſe of that External Objective Regiment *Circa Sacra*, which is granted by all our Divines to the Higher Powers in every Nation, it is much as is, or can be required in Law to the owning Epiſcopal Juriſdiction; and ſhall ſerve them to all Intents and Purpoſes, no leſs than a profeſſed Belief and Acknowledgment of the immediate Divine Right of it. That is, Although there be ſome that cannot acknowledge our Dioceſan Prelates to be Chriſt's Officers diſtinct from the *Elders* in Scripture, yet ſo long as they can live peaceable Lives in Obedience to them, as Eccleſiaſtical Magiſtrates under his Majeſty for the keeping the ſeveral Congregations in their Precincts to that Goſpel-Order which themſelves allow, and for Superviſing their Conſtitutions in things indifferent, that nothing be done but in Subordination to the Peace of the Kingdome (which is a Notion wherein the Judicious of every Party may acquieſce) it is enough

for their Reception into National Church-Union. And this is ſo far from Derogating from the Biſhops Office and Dignity, that it were a way to be choſe in Policy to advance it; while it makes his Authority ſignificant to the Presbyterian, and Independent, as well as to the Miniſter that hath a Living; and rears him an *Inſpection* over the *Gathered*, as over the *Parochial* Congregation.

And foraſmuch then, as there are moreover ſome Miniſters of a good Life, that cannot according to their Judgments allow of our Parochial Churches, nor the Book of Liturgy; but do chooſe to Worſhip God and Jeſus Chriſt in the way of their gathered or ſeparate Congregations, and crave the Protection and Clemency of the King upon their Allegiance, as other Subjects enjoy (the Conſcience being obnoxious to God only, and not capable to be conſtrained by the Rigour of Laws, or by the extreameſt Execution of them): If the Parliament-Men would know further what we would have, I *would have* theſe Men all forborn and let alone, thinking this Advantage the Church-Men have over ſuch, to be enough, that *they* have the State-Countenance, and *theſe* are uncapable in their way of all Publick Emolument till they come into them.

And to the intent the Forborn may be wrought upon by the proper Motives of their own Good, and at their own Time, I would have (as the other deſigned Part (I ſay) of ſuch a Bill) ſuch a Univerſal Act of Grace be granted, that all and every Chriſtian-Subject throughout his Majeſty's Realms, that profeſs themſelves of the Reformed Religion, be pardoned all Faults and Penalties whatſoever incurred upon the account of any forepaſſed Non-conformity, and that they ſhall not, during ſo many Years to come (as ſhall be Voted) be vexed or perſecuted any more for their Conſciences, in the matter of Religion. Provided they commit not any heinous Crime worthy of Puniſhment, but carry themſelves Innocently and Peaceably, both with Submiſſion to all due Order in their *own* Churches, and without Diſturbance to the *Civil* or *Eccleſiaſtical* Government now ſetled in the Nation.

There are theſe two Ingredients that are neceſſary to the Happineſs of the Kingdom. *Union* and *Liberty*. Union is for ſtrengthning the *Church* for *God*: Liberty is for ſtrengthning the *Land*, for the *King*. There is Trade to be encouraged, and Wars to be Managed; and *Liberty of Conſcience* ſerves theſe ends againſt our *Civil Enemies* in helping us to more hands; as *Union*

ſerves

ſerves us againſt *Popery*, and the *Enemies* of our *Religion*. And what indeed ſhould we do with our Brethren that differ from us in opinion? *Shall we ſmite them?* No, but *ſet Bread and Water before them.* Perſecution will make them more zealous and combine them, but liberty muſt brake them, or win them. They muſt have time. And if the naming what time may not be waved, and I may ſpeak who ſpake the reſt, I would ſet it during this Kings Reign, that ſo every Man may pray for his Life, and he may have the Title (more auguſtly) of *Carolus Clemens* when he dyes.

And for the making our Union of better ſignification to the Concern'd, and more effectual prevention of that Scandall which is raiſed on the Clergy through the Covetouſneſs of ſome (A fault that we Miniſters are taxed with generally, even when we ſeek but things juſt, and theſe therefore muſt take the more heed) who heap up to themſelves all the Preferments they can get, which are neither agreeable to their Labour, or their want; nor to the duty of that tremendous calling unto which they are called; but by this means, many other Miniſters are deprived even of neceſſary maintenance for their families, and an occaſion is adminiſtred to themſelves of pride (an undecent immeaſurable Exaltation above their rank and birth, to the envy of others), Of carcleſneſs (through the impoſſibility of a due attendance on a double or trebble charge), Of more worldly mindedneſs, a looſer life, and ſo of ill exampleoften times unto their flocks, whereby the Souls of many Pariſhes (which ought to be more precious to the Miniſter than his Maintenance) are ſinfully neglected, to the offence of Almighty God, and the hazzard of their own, and their peoples Salvation: I *would have no* Clergy-man henceforward be ſuffered to enjoy any more than one Living, or Cure of Souls, and one Dignity at one time; and that every man without exception, that hath more than one of either, ſhould immediately give up the reſt to be diſtributed among thoſe who ſhall be *Comprehended*, or brought into the *Eſtabliſhed Order*. Which that they may alſo be obtained, and poſſeſſed with a clear Conſcience, and that grievous Corruption of *Simony* may be extirpate out of the Land, I *wiſh* that Every Patron that ſhall hence forward preſent his Clerk to any Living, may have the Oath called the Simoniacall Oath impoſed on himſelf, no leſſe than on the Incumbent (which I perceive (ſince I writ this) is petitioned for by the Schollars of

Oxford) and if he refuſes to take it, that then the Biſhop ſhould have immediate power (taking only the ſame Oath) of preſentation in his Room.

By ſuch Materialls as theſe put into the hands of a Skillfull workman, by the Order of our Maſter builders, and by ſuch a courſe, or courſes, as this, or theſe, throughly perſued, the name of the great God would be exceedingly honoured, in the integrity and ingenuity of thoſe Gentlemen who have Benefices in their donation; in the ſelf denyall of thoſe Miniſters who have Pluralities in in their poſſeſſion; in the reſtauration of ſeveral ejected painfull Laborers into the Vineyard; in the generall advancement of Piety, and that intereſt which is Heavenly, above worldly advantage; in the unity, peace, and mutual agreement of Brethren in the ſame function differing mainly in things indifferent; in the univerſall good will among the People; and in the eſtabliſhed Happineſs and Proſperity of the Church of *England* to future Generations. *In that time ſhall the Preſent be brought unto the Lord of Hoſts, of a people ſcattered and peeled, meeted out, and troden under foot, to the place of the Name of the Lord of Hoſts, Mount* Zion.

Deo Gloria Authori Condonatio.

An Advertiſement.

READER, *I thought here to Reprint my Paper about the* Oxford-Oath, *which ſeems to be made neceſſary by my Reference to it* (p. 31.): *but becauſe the Matter thereof is incident with that of the Subſcription, I ſuppoſe it may be ſpared. I muſt ſignifie alſo, that whereas I have dropt the two Letters of my Name in reference to my Subſcription* (*in* p. 19.): *I cannot, and I do not let it go, as one that is a preſent Actual Subſcriber, but as one under Deliberation to proceed* (*or not*) *as I can, and no otherwiſe than I can, according to my Conſcience, with the ſlow haſt of others Advice, and my own ſetled Judgment.* Adieu.

FINIS.

A Postscript.

THis Paper being a Countermine against Popery, I do think fit to hasten it out, that the Members of Parliament may have competent time to consider of it this Session. I did not think the latter Part would have been so seasonable, as I humbly believe it may be now to the most of those who desire a long Life for the King, and the Growth of the Protestant Religion. It was almost Despair set me on the Work, and now there is a little Hope got into my Heart, that something may come of this Endeavour, and God's Blessing be upon it. The Reason why I annex this Half Sheet to the rest, is because I find it necessary in regard to that one Clause in the Subscription, And that the same was in it self an unlawful Oath. I desire the Reader here to remember, that I subscribe not this Clause by vertue of an Interpretation, for I think the meaning of the Law giver to be more then I can subscribe unto: but by vertue of my Liberty of Exception and Restriction. I do therefore distinguish between the Matter Covenanted, which is the Extirpation of Prelacy, or Change of Government: and the Act of Covenanting, which was their swearing to endeavour it. I would have the Reader then note also, that I subscribe not that the Oath in the Matter Covenanted was in it self unlawful: for this Matter Covenanted (I have said) may be considered Precisely in it self, or Complexly with its Circumstances, and more particularly under the Circumstance of the King's Remonstrances against the Covenant. I do believe, that an Endeavour of any Alteration of Government under this Circumstance of the King's Prohibitions that is, for any to go about it without his Consent and against it (as I speak) was Unlawfull, though I suppose it not so under the contrary Circumstances (if the King had allowed it), and consequently that it is not so in its self, if we respect onely this Matter Covenanted: But for as much as an Act becomes Evil upon every Defect, when all Circumstances must concurr to make an Action Good, and he that swore this Covenant could not swear to the Matter Precisely, but Complexly considered, that is, to the Matter under this Circumstance with others, I do apprehend that the matter being thereby render'd evil, the Oath as taken for the Act of Covenanting, in regard to this Circumstance was in it self unlawful. It may be pleaded, that the Covenant maintaines the King and his Authority to the full, and limits this Endeavour to mens Places and Callings, and that there was therefore nothing in this unlawfull. I reply, If any man should

argue rather, that the ſupream Power of this Nation does lie in the King and the Parliament as one Corporation, and when they were divided (and the Parliament could not be diſſolved) the Conſtitution was at an end, or Interſtition; That conſequently every one, & any one, might covenant, at that time, to ſet up a new Government without the conſent of Either, King or Parliament, by the way of an Agreement of the People, This were to ſay ſomething: But to own the King and his Authority, and ſwear to maintain it in the ſame Oath, wherein they ſwear to change the Government (when he declares againſt that Change, that is) without him, and againſt his Authority, this is vertually a contradiction in Adjecto, and makes the Oath in the very act it ſelf of ſwearing (if that be, or may go for, the Oath in it ſelf) unlawful. Again, To ſwear that in our place and calling, we will endeavour to change the Government when the King refuſes his conſent, What is it, but to ſwear to do that, in the doing whereof we muſt Act out of our Place and Calling, ſeeing there is, and can be, no Endeavour of that kind in our Place and Calling, but what is done with Subordination to his Conſent in an Act of Parliament? You will ſay perhaps, It is true, that they entred this Covenant without the King's Conſent, but the Meaning of the Covenant was, That the Change ſhould be made, and endeavoured to be effected only by his Conſent. I return, To enter into Covenant to Change the Government when the King by his Remonſtrances and Declarations did declare that he would not conſent to that Change, and prohibited his Subjects to enter into ſuch a League, was I ſuppoſe in it ſelf Unlawful. Or thus, To Swear againſt the King's Will or Prohibition to do a thing which to do without his Will is unlawful, is in it ſelf (I take it) an unlawful Oath. Such was this Covenant. But to proceed, It is too well known that it was the Scots brought in this Covenant, and that it is (or was) a Principle of theirs, That the Reformation of Religion belongs to the Kirk, ſo as they may (or might) ſet it up, or endeavour the ſame without the Conſent of the King, if they obtain it not (which is a Principle in my Apprehenſion directly repugnant to that Supreamacy which the Engliſh Subjects give to their King), and it was apparent, that the Covenant was carried on by the Parliament and Army according to that Principle; ſo that if any piouſly judicious Man ſhall ſcruple his Soul with the Belief that this was the Meaning of the Oath, That they ſhould endeavour a Reformation to be effected only by the King's Conſent, and not otherwiſe, I have two things to offer him for his Conviction; to wit, The conſtant Practiſe of the Covenanters to the contrary, and this one Argument, wherein

in alone I ſhall reſt. To ſwear to endeavour a Change of the Government when the King refuſes his Conſent, muſt either be with Intention to do it without his Conſent, or elſe be a vain Oath. But to do this in a diſorderly way without his Conſent, or to take the Oath in vain, either of the two, was in it ſelf (I ſuppoſe) Unlawful. Ergo, *This Oath* was in ſelf an unlawful Oath. *I would not have any of my Brethren therefore here to be ſtumbled (as they are apt to be) ſo ſoon as they diſcry the Scope of this Subſcription to tend to a Renunciation of the Covenant; for if we may be permitted to Renounce this Covenant with this Liberty of* Exception *of what is Good and Obligatory in it, and* Reſtriction *of the Renunciation to that only which is* Unlawful, *as the Endeavour of any Alteration of Government in a diſorderly way, without the Conſent of the King (as they did in the late times) was, I ſee no reaſon why they ſhould not be as forward to ſuch a Renunciation, as to any other the like Injunction. For my own part, to rid my ſelf of this Scruple quite, which in regard to the Words* in it ſelf, *have been apt to ſtick upon me ſtill in this Clauſe, I will conclude thus. If the meaning of the covenant by* endeavouring the extirpation of Prelacy, *was only to endeavour the reformation of the Church in ſubordination to the Conſent of the King with his Parliament, I put in my* exception *againſt the Clauſe: but if the intent of it was to have us endeavour any ſuch thing without his conſent, and againſt it, as the practiſe of the Covenanters did ſhew, and as it was generally (I think) underſtood, I do Subſcribe to this Clauſe,* And that the ſame was in it ſelf an unlawful Oath, *as I do to the reſt, with my Liberty of Limitation. It is but an honeſt thing (I judge) for me, and others (if they will follow), to do what we can; and ſo long as I do no more than I can, I ſhall not (I hope) hurt my Conſcience. If the Biſhop will be contented with this Rule, and we be alſo contented with it, what ſhall hinder our Concord? When the Miniſters of the* Roman *Policy have ſo long been hatching up Sects amongſt us, and fomenting our Diviſions, and even now plodding at one Thruſt, or one Blow (if Fame have any more in her Trumpet than Sound only) the general Deſtruction of our Religion, it is time (or there is Reaſon), for the Parliament to think on Union; or for the Biſhops and us, to come to Compoſition.* Then *Abner* called to *Joab*, and ſaid, ſhall the Sword devour for ever? Knoweſt thou not that it will be Bitterneſs in the latter End? How long ſhall it be then ere thou bid the People return from following of their Brethren?

The Author.

Some further Advertiſement.

LEt the *Reader* note, that where I ſpeak ſtill of all Endeavour to change the Government without the Conſent of the Supream Authority to be unlawful, I underſtand it of that Change altogether that is Publick, and concerns the Church as National. I meddle not with Reformation otherwiſe. I alſo Advertiſe the *Reader*, (ſeeing I have a Side to ſpare) That it hath bin in my thoughts (I muſt needs tell him) ever ſince the *Ejecting Act*, to offer ſomething (the beſt I could) for our Rulers Condeſcention to our Scruples: and for our Submiſſion to their Laws. That is to be Equal on both ſides. As I have formerly therefore ſent out ſeveral Papers on the Firſt Errand; Here is two ſent now upon the Second. My Paper about the *Oxford-Oath*, and this Paper. I have ſome Sheets more by me (under Twenty) that carry Things a little Higher, if not quite Home; and I could not let them therefore come out, till this Paper ſhould make their Way for them. They have bin long ready, and bin ſeen by many, as Biſhop *Wilkins*, Judge *Hales*, and the like Temperate Perſons. I ſhall Entitle thoſe Sheets, *A Peaceable Reſolution of Conſcience concerning our preſent Impoſitions.* When that Book alſo is come abroad (out of which I have bin borrowing ſomething or other ſtill for the Papers and Books that ſince paſſed from me) I ſhall have accompliſhed my Purpoſe, and intend to have done for ever about theſe Matters. I muſt add, that I have juſt now Received this enſuing Letter.

To my Honoured Friend, Mr. —— *in* Oxenden-*Street.*

SIR,

I *Thank you heartily for your Kindneſs, in ſending me your* Healing Paper *ſo ſpeedily. This Day I received it, and read it to my great Satisfaction. I fully agree with the Rule which you have laid down in order to Peace and Concord; and judg, that in the whole Management of the Deſigne, you have done Honeſtly and Prudently. I firmly believe that Union by a reaſonable Accommodation, is Religions Intereſt. The Relaxation that would ſuffice you, I think would ſuffice me. In the Terms of Conformity as explained and limited by you, with thoſe neceſſary Reſtrictions, there is no material Difference between you and me, as I diſcern.* —— *My earneſt Prayer is, that God would proſper this your Deſigne of Peace; And I am much perſwaded, that Good will come of it.*

Chicheſter, Octob. 12. 1678.

Your Obliged and Affectionate Friend & Servant, John Cozbet.